



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/438,645	11/12/1999	BRIAN GARRY JENKIN	JA999-715	9655

39903 7590 10/21/2004

ANTHONY ENGLAND  
PO Box 5307  
AUSTIN, TX 78763-5307

EXAMINER
----------

TODD, GREGORY G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2157

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/438,645

Applicant(s)

JENKIN, BRIAN GARRY

Examiner

Gregory G Todd

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 10, 12-18 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-6, 10, 12-18 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This is a fifth office action in response to applicant's amendment filed, 29 June 2004, of application filed, with the above serial number, on 12 November 2000 in which claims 2 and 10 have been amended. Claims 2-6, 10, 12-18, and 22 are therefore pending in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation " said server's capacity " in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 2-6, 10, and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fletcher et al (hereinafter "Fletcher", 6,363,477).

As per Claim 2, Fletcher teaches a method for testing performance of a server running a chosen computing application, wherein Fletcher teaches:

(a) forming on the client a first collection of a number of live maps, wherein such a live map includes i) identification of an application layer transaction for actual processing of the transactions by the server running a chosen computing application, and ii) data for the chosen application, including data formed at the client application layer, and wherein the chosen computing application of the transaction for such a live map is the same for each of the live maps in the collection (at least col. 8 line 53 - col. 9 line 17; application layer of client generating request data packet transmitted to server);

(b) passing the collection from the client application layer to the client middleware layer (at least col. 8 line 53 - col. 9 line 4);

(c) transmitting a first processing load from the client to the server running said computing application, wherein the processing load includes the first collection of the number of said live maps for a plurality of said transactions (at least col. 9, lines 5-17; col. 10, lines 10-29; client sending data packets for network application of interest);

(d) measuring one or more performance criteria resulting from said server actually processing said load, wherein the measuring of one or more performance criteria includes: i) time stamping such a live map by the client before the transmitting of such a processing load to the server and ii) receiving, by the client, a reply map for the live map from the server after the server processes the load, wherein the reply map includes server processing time measured by the server so that the client is able to compute elapsed time from a client perspective and compare ones of the client-

Art Unit: 2157

perspective elapsed times to ones of the server processing times for specific ones of the application layer transactions to determine server and network latency (at least col. 12 line 40 - col. 13 line 30; network latency calculated from network round trip time minus application processing time); and

(e) changing the first collection of live maps and transmitting a next processing load from the client to the server, the next processing load including the changed collection of live maps in order to selectively vary said processing loads, wherein the changing includes changing the number of said live maps and types of said transactions in the first collection of live maps transmitted to said server, and wherein said measuring step (d) is repeated for the next processing load (accumulating statistics for measurements and storing in user-history table for different intervals of time or applications) (at least col. 11, lines 40-48; col. 16, lines 36-59; col. 17, lines 12-34).

5. As per Claim 3.

(f) comparing performance criteria against predetermined performance measures to determine whether said server's capacity is satisfactory (minimum, maximum, average and median statistics) (at least col. 11, lines 40-48).

6. As per Claim 4.

performance criteria include average response time for a transaction within such a load (average time) (at least col. 11, lines 40-48).

7. As per Claim 5.

performance criteria include the proportion of server CPU time taken by a transaction of such a load (application processing time) (at least col. 12 line 54 - col. 13 line 4).

8. As per Claim 6.

wherein step (d) comprises for each transaction within said load, returning a result to said client (at least col. 13, lines 19-57; request packet and correlated response packet); and

measuring, by said client or by said server, the one or more performance criteria responsive to the processing of said load by said server (at least col. 12 line 54 - col. 13 line 30 ).

9. As per Claim 10, Fletcher teaches a system for testing server performance, wherein Fletcher teaches:

(a) a server running a chosen computing application (at least col. 10, lines 10-29; network application);

(b) a client emulation server ("client") representing a plurality of individual client computing stations (single client representing plurality of clients), wherein a computing operation performed by the client resides in an application layer that communicates with a middleware layer on the client, said client emulation server including a first collection of a number of live maps, wherein a live map includes i) identification of an application layer transaction for actual processing of the transactions by the server running the chosen computing application, and ii) data for the chosen application, and wherein the

Art Unit: 2157

chosen computing application of the transaction for such a live map is the same for each of the live maps in the collection (at least col. 8 line 53 - col. 9 line 17; col. 8, lines 43-52; application layer of client generating request data packet transmitted to server); and

(c) a communications connection between said client and said server (at least col. 3, lines 43-47), wherein said client is operable to transmit a first processing load to said server via said communications connection, the processing load including the first collection of said live maps for a plurality of said transactions, said server is operable to actually process said load, wherein the measuring of one or more performance criteria includes: i) time stamping such a live map by the client before the transmitting of such a processing load to the server and ii) receiving, by the client, a reply map for the live map from the server after the server processes the load, wherein the reply map includes server processing time measured by the server so that the client is able to compute elapsed time from a client perspective and compare ones of the client-perspective elapsed times to ones of the server processing times for specific ones of the application layer transactions to determine server and network latency; and wherein said client is further operable to change the first collection of live maps and transmit a next processing load to the server, the next processing load including the changed collection of live maps, in order to selectively vary said processing loads, wherein the changing includes changing the number of said live maps and types of said transactions in the first collection of live maps, and the first server or client is operable to repeat the measuring for the next processing load (at least col. 12 line 40 - col. 13 line 30; col. 11,

Art Unit: 2157

lines 40-48; col. 16, lines 36-59; col. 17, lines 12-34; network latency calculated from network round trip time minus application processing time and accumulating statistics for measurements and storing in user-history table for different intervals of time or applications).

10. As per Claim 12

wherein said server compares said measured performance criteria against predetermined performance measures to determine whether the server has satisfactory capacity (minimum, maximum, average and median statistics) (at least col.11, lines 40-48).

11. As per Claim 13.

wherein said server stores a file of said performance data measures (at least col. 10, lines 55-67; col. 11, lines 31-48; shared buffer/ table).

12. As per Claim 14.

wherein said client stores a file of said performance data measures (at least col. 10, lines 55-67; col. 11, lines 31-48; shared buffer/ table).

13. As per Claim 14.

server produces an output representing performance data measures (at least Fig. 11; col. 18, lines 45-56; report performance stats).

14. As per Claim 15.

wherein said performance data criteria includes the average response time for a transaction within one of said loads (average time) (at least col. 11, lines 40-48).

15. As per Claim 16.



wherein said performance data criteria includes the proportion of server CPU time taken by such a transaction of said loads (application processing time) (at least col. 12 line 54 - col. 13 line 4).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 17-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fletcher in view of Wang (hereinafter "Wang", 6,446,028).

18. As per Claim 17.

Fletcher fails to explicitly disclose wherein said server has connection to one or more database servers, said database servers being operable to execute portions of said load transactions. However, the use and advantages for using such databases is well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Wang. Wang teaches servers communicating with databases and clients and the network latency associated (at least Wang Fig. 5, 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of Wang's databases into Fletcher's system as this is very well known in the art and servers are very commonly executing and communicating with

databases and Fletcher teaches the client using network applications including database management systems.

19. As per Claim 18.

wherein said server comprises a plurality of servers (at least Fletcher col. 8, lines 43-52),

Fletcher fails to explicitly disclose each of said server plurality has connection to one or more database servers, said database servers being operable to execute portions of said load transactions. However, the use and advantages for using such databases is well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Wang. Wang teaches servers communicating with databases and clients and the network latency associated (at least Wang Fig. 5, 9; col. 11, lines 1-2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of Wang's databases into Fletcher's system as this is very well known in the art and servers are very commonly executing and communicating with databases and Fletcher teaches the client using network applications including database management systems.

20. As per Claim 22.

Fletcher fails to explicitly disclose at least one database in communication with said server. However, the use and advantages for using such databases is well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Wang. Wang teaches servers communicating with databases and clients and the network latency associated (at least Wang Fig. 5, 9). Therefore, it would have

Art Unit: 2157

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of Wang's databases into Fletcher's system as this is very well known in the art and servers are very commonly executing and communicating with databases and Fletcher teaches the client using network applications including database management systems.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2 and 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Newly cited Burdick et al and Poulin in addition to previously cited Friedrich et al, Kaler et al, Mukherjee et al (paragraph 23), Baghai et al, Caccavale et al, Davies et al, Sherman et al, Chen et al, Wagle, Dantressangle, Braddy, Congdon, Hoyer et al, Eilert et al, and Richardson are cited for disclosing pertinent information related to the claimed invention. Applicants are requested to consider the prior art reference for relevant teachings when responding to this office action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory G Todd whose telephone number is (571)272-4011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm.

Art Unit: 2157

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (703)308-7562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory Todd 

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100

  
ARIO ETIENNE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100